

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 04 2006

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this patent application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, 17-21, and 26-31 have been previously rejected as being non-enabling under 35 USC 112; Claims 20, 26, 27, 29, and 30 have been previously rejected as being unpatentable over Winn in view of Poulsen under 35 USC 103; Claims 8, 18, and 21 have been previously rejected as being unpatentable over Winn in view of Poulsen and Baker et al. under 35 USC 103; Claims 2-5, 7, and 17 have been previously rejected as being unpatentable over Winn in view of Poulsen and Teggarden et al. under 35 USC 103; Claim 19 has been previously rejected as being unpatentable over Winn in view of Poulsen, Baker et al., and Ferguson under 35 USC 103; Claim 6 has been previously rejected as being unpatentable over Winn in view of Poulsen, Teggarden et al., Price, and Ferguson under 35 USC 103; and Claims 28 and 31 have been previously objected to as containing allowable subject matter

but being dependent from rejected parent claims. Claims 26 and 29 have been cancelled, new Claims 32 and 33 have been inserted, and consequently, Claims 2-8,17-21, and 27,28, and 30-33 are now active in this patent application.

In the office action dated February 13, 2006, the Examiner noted that the status of all of the claims of the patent application was not properly set forth and that correction was accordingly required.

By means of the present amendment, the status of all of the claims is respectfully submitted to now be properly set forth, it having been realized that the status of Claims 19 and 21 were inadvertently characterized as "previously inserted" in lieu of the proper designation of -previously presented--. Therefore, the status of such Claims 19 and 21 have now been accordingly revised and properly identified as being --previously presented--.

In addition, it is noted that for brevity purposes,

the particular claim rejections, amendments to the claims, and the arguments for patentability of the amended claims, as set forth within the previously filed amendment of January 30, 2006, will not be repeated herein, but it is respectfully noted to the examiner that such amendments and arguments, as set forth in the previously filed amendment of January 30, 2006 remain applicable in connection with the outstanding office action on the merits, and are hereby effectively incorporated herein by reference.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this patent application now patentably define over all of the art of record, that this patent application is therefore in condition for allowance, and accordingly, an early and favorable action is now anticipated and awaited.

Respectfully Submitted,
SCHWARTZ & WEINRIEB



Steven W. Weinrieb
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 26,520
(703) 415-1250